



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/816,645      | 04/02/2004  | Michael D. Pashley   | US000386A           | 1083             |

24737 7590 10/06/2008  
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NEGRON, ISMAEL

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2885

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

10/06/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |                                       |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/816,645 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>PASHLEY ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>ISMAEL NEGRON     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2885               |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 September 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Applicant's amendment filed on September 5, 2008 has been entered. No claim has been amended, cancelled, or added. Claims 19-42 are still pending in this application, with claims 19 and 37-39 being independent.
2. The replacement drawing sheet was received on September 5, 2008. These drawings are acceptable.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 19-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397).
4. MASUTANI et al. discloses a side-emitting device having:
  - **a light transmitting rod (as recited in claims 19 and 38)**, Figure 1, reference number 4;

Art Unit: 2885

- **the rod permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in claims 19 and 38), column 2, lines 60-63;**
- **a reflective outcoupling material (as recited in claims 19 and 38), Figure 2, reference number 5;**
- **the outcoupling material being affixed to the outer surface of the rod (as recited in claims 19 and 38), column 2, lines 56-59;**
- **the width of the outcoupling material controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the rod (as recited in claims 19 and 38), column 2, lines 16-22;**
- **the light source including a plurality of LED (as recited in Claim 20), column 4, lines 1-3;**
- **the plurality of LED including at least a red, a green and a blue LED (as recited in Claim 21), column 4, lines 16-18;**
- **the red, green and blue LED being mixed to generate white light (as recited in Claim 21), as evidenced by column 4, lines 12-18;**
- **the red, green and blue LEDs being mixed to generate white light chromaticity (as recited in Claim 22), as evidenced by column 4, lines 12-18;**
- **the red, green and blue LEDs being mixed to generate dynamic color effects (as recited in Claim 23), as evidenced by column 4, lines 12-18;**

Art Unit: 2885

- **the rod being a flexible rod (as recited in Claim 24)**, column 2 and 3, lines 60-67 and 1-5, respectively;
- **the rod being a rigid rod (as recited in Claim 25)**, column 2 and 3, lines 60-67 and 1-5, respectively;
- **the outcoupling material being a paint (as recited in Claim 26)**, column 3, line 6;
- **the paint being white paint (as recited in Claim 27)**, column 3, lines 6-8;
- **the white paint being distributed in such a way as to control the angular distribution of the light leaving the rod (as recited in Claim 28)**, as evidenced by column 3, lines 38-45;
- **the white paint being distributed in such a way as to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 29)**, as evidenced by column 3, lines 38-45; and
- **an elliptical rod (as recited in Claim 30)**, as seen in Figure 2.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2885

at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397).

6. MASUTANI et al. individually discloses (see previous section 4), all the limitations of the claims, except the rod being a square rod (as recited in Claim 31).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to shape the rod of the device of MASUTANI et al. as a square rod (as recited in Claim 31), since it has been held by the courts that a change in shape or configuration, without any criticality, is nothing more than one of numerous shapes that one of ordinary skill in the art will find obvious to provide based on the suitability for the intended final application. See *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976). In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select a specific shape as necessitated by the particular requirements of a specific application, as admitted by the applicant (see pages 5 and 6, lines 19-24 and 1-4, respectively).

8. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397) in view of HASSLER, Jr. (U.S. Pat. 4,954,931).

Art Unit: 2885

9. MASUTANI et al. individually discloses (see previous sections 4), all the limitations of the claims, except:

- the angular width of the reflective outcoupling material varying along the length of the rod to provide substantially uniform light distribution (as recited in Claim 32);
- the rod being having combination of square and curve edges (as recited in Claim 32); or
- the combination of square and curve edges varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 33).

10. HASSLER, Jr. discloses a side-illuminating device having:

- **a light source (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 3, reference numbers 17 and 19;
- **a light transmitting rod (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 1, reference number 13;
- **the rod permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in Claim 19)**, as evidenced by column 2, lines 64-69;
- **an outcoupling portion (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 3, reference number 59;
- **the outcoupling portion being formed on the outer surface of the rod (as recited in Claim 19)**, column 3, lines 16-18;

- **the width of the outcoupling portion controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the rod (as recited in Claim 19), inherent;**
- **the width of the outcoupling portion being determined to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 19), column 3, lines 36-39.**

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to vary the angular width of the outcoupling material of MASUTANI et al. to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod, as per the teachings of HASSLER, Jr. (column 3, lines 36-39).

12. Regarding the rod having combination of square and curve edges (as recited in Claim 32), such combination of edges varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 33), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to shape the rod of the device of MASUTANI et al. and HASSLER, Jr. as claimed, since it has been held by the courts that a change in shape or configuration, without any criticality, is nothing more than one of numerous shapes that one of ordinary skill in the art will find obvious to provide based on the suitability for the intended final application. See *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976). In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select a specific shape as necessitated by the particular requirements of a specific application, as admitted by the applicant (see pages 5 and 6, lines 19-24 and 1-4, respectively).



Art Unit: 2885

13. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397) in view of ASHALL (U.S. Pat. 5,390,436).

14. MASUTANI et al. discloses all the limitations of the claims (as detailed in previous section 7), except the outcoupling material including a combination of white paint and fine dots with varying packing density (as recited in Claim 34).

15. ASHALL discloses a side-emitting panel having:

- **a light source (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 1, reference number 21;
- **a light transmitting panel**, Figure 1, reference number 10;
- **the panel permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in Claim 19)**, as evidenced by Figure 1;
- **an outcoupling material (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 1, reference number 13;
- **the outcoupling material being affixed to the outer surface of the panel (as recited in Claim 19)**, column 3, lines 15-17;
- **the outcoupling material including a combination of white paint and fine dots (as recited in Claim 34)**, column 3, lines 56-59; and
- **the combination of white paint and fine dots having a varying packing density (as recited in Claim 34)**, column 3, lines 59 and 60.

Art Unit: 2885

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to include a combination of white paint and fine dots with varying packing density (as recited in Claim 34) as the outcoupling material of the patented device of MASUTANI et al., to be able to enhance uniform light emission from the side of the rod, as per the teachings of ASHALL.

17. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397) in view of REID et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,267,492).

18. MASUTANI et al. discloses all the limitations of the claims (as detailed in previous section 7), except a mirror located at the end of the rod away from the light source (as recited in Claim 35), such mirror reflecting light that travels the entire length of the rod (as recited in Claim 36).

19. REID et al. discloses a side-emitting device having:

- **a light source (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 1, reference number 10;
- **a light transmitting rod (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 1, reference number 20;
- **the rod permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in Claim 19)**, column 5, lines 36-43;

Art Unit: 2885

- **an outcoupling material (as recited in Claim 19)**, Figure 3B, reference number 226;
- **the outcoupling material being affixed to the outer surface of the rod (as recited in Claim 19)**, column 6, lines 33-36; and
- **a mirror (as recited in Claim 35)**, Figure 6A, reference number 626;
- **the mirror being located at the end of the rod away from the light source (as recited in Claim 35)**, column 9, lines 50 and 51; and
- **the mirror reflecting light that travels the entire length of the rod (as recited in Claim 36)**, column 9, lines 50-54.

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to include the end mirror of REID et al. in the rod of the device of MASUTANI et al. and HASSLER, Jr., to be able to reflect back along the rod light that traveled the entire length of the rod, as per the teachings of REID et al.

21. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397) in view of HASSLER, Jr. (U.S. Pat. 4,954,931).

22. MASUTANI et al. discloses a side-emitting device having:

Art Unit: 2885

- **a light transmitting rod (as recited in Claim 38)**, Figure 1, reference number 4;
- **the rod permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in Claim 38)**, column 2, lines 60-63;
- **a reflective outcoupling material (as recited in Claim 38)**, Figure 2, reference number 5;
- **the outcoupling material being affixed to the outer surface of the rod (as recited in Claim 38)**, column 2, lines 56-59; and
- **the width of the outcoupling material controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the rod (as recited in Claim 38)**, column 2, lines 16-22.

23. MASUTANI et al. discloses all the limitations of the claims, except the angular width of the outcoupling material varying along the length of the rod to provide substantially uniform light distribution (as recited in Claim 38).

24. HASSLER, Jr. discloses a side-illuminating device having:

- **a light source (as recited in Claim 38)**, Figure 3, reference numbers 17 and 19;
- **a light transmitting rod (as recited in Claim 38)**, Figure 1, reference number 13;
- **the rod permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in Claim 38)**, as evidenced by column 2, lines 64-69;

- **an outcoupling portion (as recited in Claim 38), Figure 3, reference number 59;**
- **the outcoupling portion being formed on the outer surface of the rod (as recited in Claim 38), column 3, lines 16-18;**
- **the width of the outcoupling portion controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the rod (as recited in Claim 38), inherent;**
- **the width of the outcoupling portion being determined to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 38), column 3, lines 36-39.**

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to adjust the angular width of the outcoupling material of MASUTANI et al. to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod, as per the teachings of HASSLER, Jr. (column 3, lines 36-39).

26. Method Claim 37 is suggested by the combined teachings of MASUTANI et al. and HASSLER, Jr. (as detailed in previous sections 24-27).

27. Claims 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397) in view of YOKOYAMA (U.S. Pat. 5,134,549).

28. MASUTANI et al. discloses a side-emitting device having:

Art Unit: 2885

- **a light source (as recited in Claim 39), Figure 1, reference number 3;**
- **a light transmitting rod (as recited in Claim 39), Figure 1, reference number 4;**
- **the rod permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in Claim 39), column 2, lines 60-63;**
- **a reflective outcoupling material (as recited in Claim 39), Figure 2, reference number 5;**
- **the outcoupling material being affixed to the outer surface of the rod (as recited in Claim 39), column 2, lines 56-59; and**
- **the outcoupling material controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the rod (as recited in Claim 39), column 2, lines 16-22; and**
- **he outcoupling material including fine dots with varying packing density (as recited in Claim 42), column 3, lines 6-22.**

29. MASUTANI et al. discloses all the limitations of the claims, except:

- the angular width of the reflective outcoupling material varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 39);
- the reflective outcoupling material being distributed in a series of stripes perpendicular to the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 39);

- at least one of the width of the spacing between the stripes or the width of the stripes varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 40); or
- the width of the spacing between the stripes varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 41).

30. YOKOYAMA discloses a side-emitting device having:

- **a light source (as recited in Claim 39)**, Figure 11, reference number 1;
- **a light transmitting member (as recited in Claim 39)**, Figure 11, reference number 2;
- **the member permitting substantially total internal reflection (as recited in Claim 39)**, column 1, lines 20-25;
- **a reflective outcoupling material (as recited in Claim 39)**, Figure 11, reference number 6;
- **the outcoupling material being affixed to the outer surface of the member (as recited in Claim 39)**, column 3, lines 63-68;
- **the outcoupling material controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the member (as recited in Claim 39)**, column 4, lines 5-10;
- **the angular width of the reflective outcoupling material varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 39)**, as seen in Figure 19;

- **the reflective outcoupling material being distributed in a series of stripes perpendicular to the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 39), as seen in Figure 19;**
- **at least one of the width of the spacing between the stripes or the width of the stripes varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 40), as seen in figures 11 and 19; and**
- **the width of the spacing between the stripes varying along the length of the rod (as recited in Claim 41), as seen in figures 11 and 19.**

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to form the outcoupling material of MASUTANI et al. as the variable density stripes of YOKOYAMA, to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod, as per the teachings of YOKOYAMA.

### ***Response to Arguments***

32. Applicant's arguments filed September 5, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

33. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397), the applicant argues that the cited reference fails to disclose all the features of the claimed invention, specifically an angular width of the reflective material controlling the angular distribution of light leaving



Art Unit: 2885

the side of the rod. The applicant further argues that MASUTANI et al. states the reflected light forming linear light with high directivity, which, according to the applicant, clearly shows that the cited reference does not intend for the distribution of light to be adjusted as it would be undesirable for its intended use.

34. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 20-30 and 34-36, the applicant present no arguments, except stating that such claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 19 and would be allowable when/if the independent claim is allowed.

35. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 20-30 and 34-36, the applicant present no arguments, except stating that such claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 19 and would be allowable when/if the independent claim is allowed.

36. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 37-42, the applicant present no arguments, except stating that such claims present features paralleling those presented by Claim 19, and are allowable at least for the same reasons.

37. In response to applicant's arguments that MASUTANI et al. fail to disclose reflective material controlling the angular distribution of light, the applicant is advised that in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom. *In re Preda*, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968).

In this case, one skill in the art would have easily recognized that it is the reflective outcoupling material 5 of MASUTANI et al. what causes light to be outputted from an outer surface of the rod 4, that is, the arrangement of the outcoupling material 5 controls the lateral emission of light out of the rod 4. One skilled in the art would have further recognized that the angular distribution of such laterally emitted light, as the angle of emission increases as the distance from the emission axis increases (as clearly evidenced by Figure 3), therefore the width of the outcoupling material 5 directly controls the angular distribution of the light output.

In addition, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., adjustability of the angular distribution) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

38. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)) as unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397), the applicant argues that the cited reference fails to disclose all the features of the claimed invention, specifically the claimed different cross-sectional shapes of the rod. The applicant further argues that the claimed shapes are a critical feature for achieving a desired angular distribution.

39. In response to applicant's arguments that MASUTANI et al. fail to disclose, or even suggest, a rod having claimed cross-sectional shapes, the applicant is once again

Art Unit: 2885

advised that it has been held by the courts that a change in shape or configuration, without any criticality in operation of the device, is nothing more than one of numerous shapes that one of ordinary skill in the art will find obvious to provide based on the suitability for the intended final application. See *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976). In this case, as admitted by the applicant (page 2, line 21, through page 3, line 2; and page 5, line 18 through page 6, line 1) selecting a specific cross-sectional shape for the rod of the patented device of MASUTANI et al. would amount to merely applying well known laws of refraction to obtain a desired angular distribution, such laws of refraction providing results which are neither non-obvious nor unexpected.

40. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over MASUTANI et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,488,397) in view of HASSLER, Jr. (U.S. Pat. 4,954,931), the applicant argues that the cited combination of references is improper since they feature different geometries and topologies.

41. In response to applicant's argument that MASUTANI et al. and HASSLER, Jr. are not combinable, the applicant is, once again, strongly advised that test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In this case, as previously detailed in sections 8-12, MASUTANI et al. discloses a side-emitting device having a light source 3 and a light transmitting rod 4 including an outcoupling material 5 for controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the rod 4. HASSLER, Jr., on the other hand, discloses a side-emitting device including light sources 17/19 and a light transmitting rod 13 including an outcoupling portion 59 for controlling the angular distribution of light leaving the side of the rod 13, such outcoupling portion 59 having a varying width determined to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod 13. Modifying the patented side-emitting device MASUTANI et al. to include a variable width outcoupling material 5 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. One would have been motivated to ensure uniform light distribution along the length of the rod 4 of MASUTANI et al., as per the teachings of HASSLER, Jr.

### ***Conclusion***

42. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

43. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2885

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

44. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ismael Negron whose telephone number is (571) 272-2376. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jong-Suk (James) Lee, can be reached on (571) 272-7044. The facsimile machine number for the Art Group is (571) 273-8300.

45. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) toll-free at 866-217-9197.

/Ismael Negron/  
Primary Examiner  
AU 2885